

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHER DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
WESTERN DIVISION**

SCOTT PARSONS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**SHENZHEN FEST TECHNOLOGY CO., Ltd.,
a/k/a Efest power, a/k/a Efest, and Mt. Baker
Vapor, LLC, a Limited Liability Company with
its principle place of business in Mesa, Arizona**

Defendants.

CASE NO. 18-CV-8506

JOINT INITIAL STATUS REPORT

1. The Nature of the Case:

A. **Plaintiff's Counsel**

Donovan S. Robertson
100 17th Street, Suite 405, Rock Island, IL 61201
Telephone: 309-788-0471
Facsimile: 309-788-0480
Email: drobertson@sbrlawfirm.law

Defendant, Mt. Baker Vapor's Counsel

David M. Holmes (lead attorney)
Christen J. McGlynn
55 W. Monroe Street, Suite, 3800, Chicago, IL 6060
Telephone: 312-704-0550
Email: david.holmes@wilsonelser.com
Christen.mcglynn@wilsonelser.com

- B. This is a products liability related to an ecigarette. Plaintiff alleges that a lithium ion battery that he was using in an ecigarette caught on fire and burned him.
- C. i. Nature and extent of plaintiff's injury.
ii. Scope of the defendant's liability as distributor of product.

iii. Effect of manufacturer's status as a Chinese corporation with no known U.S. facilities.

D. Plaintiff seeks money damages to compensate for his injuries.

2. Jurisdiction.

A. No basis for federal questions jurisdiction.

B. (1) The amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00. Plaintiff's medical bills would justify the \$75,000.00 threshold.

(2) Scott Parsons is a citizen of the State of Illinois, having been domiciled there for many years preceding the incident. He is currently domiciled in Illinois, and has no intention, presently, of removing himself from Illinois.

Mt. Baker Vapor LLC is an Arizona corporation with its principal place of business/headquarters in Mesa, Arizona. The LLC has two members. One member is an individual who resides in Arizona and the other is an individual who resides in California.

3. Status of Service.

Defendant, Shenzen Technology Co., LTD , a/k/a Efest Power, a/k/a Efest, has not been served, proceedings are pending pursuant to the Hague Convention. The Complaint has been translated into Chinese and is in the process of being served upon the defendant.

4. Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate:

There is **no** consent to a United States Magistrate.

5. Motions:

A. There are no pending motions.

B. Defendant has responded to the initial complaint.

6. Case Plan:

A. The Western Division of the Northern District of Illinois does not participate in the MIDP, therefore, this is not applicable to the instant case.

(1) Defendant Mt. Baker Vapor has served Plaintiff with Interrogatories and Requests

to Produce that lists general discovery needed.

(2) March 8, 2019

(3) Written discovery was issued to Plaintiff on 2/5/19 by Defendant, Mt. Baker Vapor.

(4) September 30, 2019

(5) December 31, 2019

(6) Not applicable.

(7) January 30, 2020

C. (1) Jury trial is requested.

(2) Estimated length of trial 3-4 days.

7. Status of Settlement Discussions:

A. No substantial settlement negotiations have taken place.

B. Not applicable.

C. Parties have not requested a settlement conference.